

15 20
HOMŒOPATHY.

REASONS FOR ADOPTING THE
RATIONAL SYSTEM
OF
MEDICINE:

BEING A LETTER TO
The Governors of the Hull General Infirmary.

BY
FEWSTER ROBERT HORNER, M.D.,

Late President, and Perpetual Vice-President of the British Medical and
Surgical Association; late Senior Physician to the Hull General
Infirmary, and to the Hull Dispensary, &c. &c.

" Quoth Hudibras—' It is no part
Of prudence to cry down an art,
And what it can perform deny,
Because you understand not why.' "
HUDIBRAS.

SECOND EDITION.

LONDON:
GROOMBRIDGE & CO., PATERNOSTER ROW.

HULL: J. L. SEATON, 30, WHITEFRIARGATE.

MANCHESTER: H. TURNER, 41, PICCADILLY.

1857.

PRICE SIXPENCE.

PREFACE TO THE SECOND EDITION.

I CANNOT but express my deep satisfaction—my thankfulness—that this little pamphlet has been so well received by the public, and so extensively circulated. Not only has the first edition of 2,500 copies been sold in the course of three or four weeks, but, as the publisher informs me, 2,300 additional ones of the second edition have already been bespoken. This affords certain evidence that a spirit of inquiry into the truths of Homœopathy is now awakened, and that the public is manifesting a deep and anxious interest in any additional testimony respecting it.

It is a yet more gratifying fact, and one of great and significant importance—affecting whole communities, that no less than ten medical gentlemen have written to me, declaring their determination honestly and practically to investigate the Homœopathic treatment, having been induced to “lay aside all prejudice” on reading my own testimony and remarks.

This is a cheering result, and one that repays me one hundred-fold for the storm of opposition my pamphlet has stirred up in the hearts, or at least in the action and bearing, of the Medical Profession of my own town; two of the professional gentlemen alluded to reside, however, in this neighbourhood.

I have the satisfaction of knowing—and that from the most *substantial* testimony—that the public mind of Hull is now awakened to the importance of the Homœopathic treatment. This leads to trial of its benefits, and trial to conviction. It is my fixed belief that, in a short time, the medical profession of Hull will be driven—compelled to investigate the truths of Homœopathy. In the end this will prove to have been to them a happy necessity, although the gate of reason was unbarred by the threatening finger of adversity.

F. R. HORNER, M.D.

Hull, 20th July, 1857.

TO THE GOVERNORS OF THE HULL
GENERAL INFIRMARY.

MY LORDS, LADIES, AND GENTLEMEN,

I think it a duty to you and to myself, now to give a full explanation of those circumstances which have led to a change in my medical opinions.

As only a portion of the supporters of this excellent Medical Charity have, as yet, experienced or witnessed the benefit of Homœopathic treatment, there are many that are still unaware of its great superiority over the old system. I was, therefore, desirous to avoid making Homœopathy a possible cause of dissension by requesting of you its introduction into the Infirmary, feeling well assured that those who do know its value would have supported that request, and even made its acceptance a *sine quâ non* in respect to their own continued support.

I wished, however, to prove to the Governors that I was not only willing, but anxious, to continue my office, if arrangements for the Homœopathic treatment could be made. Hence, I presented a written request to the Chairman of the Infirmary Weekly Board, that two separate wards, one for female and one for male patients,—

Homœopathic medicines and a dispenser,—should be at my disposal and under my own control. Though such arrangement has now been denied, I have the satisfaction of reflecting, that the time is surely approaching when none other but the Homœopathic treatment of disease will be tolerated in our public Medical Institutions. This is not the utterance of a vain and specious sentiment, but the calm conviction of a mind impressed with the force of truth. For in proverbial language,—“*Magna est veritas et prævalebit.*”

The following remarks will show to you in what manner I, happily, became enlightened to the truth of Homœopathy. And so entirely am I convinced that, in my own case, the changing of opinion has been but the forsaking of error, that I wholly cast aside every apologetic sentiment or thought, and, in the simple candour of truth, confess that, whereas I was blind, now I see.

“It is interesting,” says a modern philosopher, “to trace the principles by which an enlightened mind is influenced in receiving, upon testimony, statements which are rejected by the vulgar as totally incredible.” He then shows us how such a mind, reflecting that it now knows to be true many things which at one time it deemed incredible, is ever ready to admit that many other principles in science, or phenomena in nature, which it now comprehends not, may in reality be true; for it no longer dares to make its own knowledge the test of probability. How forcible is the lesson of wisdom here conveyed,

and how applicable to the study of Homœopathy, as well as to the opposition and prejudice which would stay its progress !

I confess that it was not an unmixed, or a purely spontaneous and enlightened desire to search after truth, that first prompted my inquiry into this new system of medicine. I was also led thereto by the unsatisfactory and ever-varying systems of the old school of physic, and by the conviction, that positive evil is inseparable from the old method of cure.

I refer not specially to blood-letting,—that terrible evil,—but to another, a more insidious, yet a most serious one, and concerning which some of the profession would seem to be ignorant, and all maintain a significant silence : I mean the retention and deposition of drugs in the various parts, structures, and vital organs of the body.

Impressed with this startling and well-ascertained fact (and one which was so forcibly made known to the world at large by Professor Christia~~n~~, Doctor Taylor, and others, on the occasion of a late criminal's trial), that drugs, administered to a patient, permeate every part of the human body, and there lodge for indefinite periods of time,—deposited or interwoven, as it were, in the internal vital parts and organs ;—I felt, as some others have felt, and amongst themselves acknowledged, that this was, indeed, a subject for most serious and painful thought.

I shall refer to the subject again ; and give you proof and examples where not only mineral, but also vegetable drugs, as Aloes, Colocynth, &c., which had

so/

been administered even some years before, remained deposited in the system, producing a miserable and wholly shattered state, both of mental and of bodily health ; but where the patients were, eventually, happily restored, by the removal of these latent (and there poisonous) drugs.

It now affords me the deepest satisfaction to reflect, that I have not, to my present knowledge, prescribed blood-letting more than twice in the last ten or fifteen years, either in public or in private practice; and that I have ever discouraged what is called the active or heroic treatment of disease; a sort of treatment which oft may aptly be described as that which does the most mischief in the shortest space of time. Both in my course of lectures on "*Materia Medica*" (the properties of drugs), at the Hull School of Medicine, and in my occasional remarks made to students in the Infirmary, at the bedside of the sick, I have given the caution to avoid the evil of prescribing too much medicine; but so inveterate is this evil, and one so early imbibed, of drugging patients, and especially that of putting a variety of medicine into one mixture, "to fight together in the dark," as the late President of the Royal College of Physicians so truly observed, that I know how little orthodox my sentiments have been held by many. Nay, I have been roundly spoken of as one by whom neither surgeons nor druggists could live, and have suffered accordingly in the estimation of many. As my patients, however, not only lived but were cured, and that at least as quickly and as thoroughly as the

patients of others, it was enough—or rather, much better.

I had the satisfaction of knowing that I was supported in my opinions and practice by the example of the wisest and most experienced among Physicians; for it is ever found that such trust less and less to active and powerful drugs, bleeding, &c. &c., as experience and long observation of disease ripens knowledge into wisdom; and they use that knowledge rather in assisting nature, than in weakening or destroying her energies in bold, “heroic” efforts to subdue disease. Sir John Forbes, for example, as well as so humble an individual as myself, also “suffered in estimation;” and the Medical Journal in which he wrote his famous exposure of “Old Physic,”* shortly afterwards changed hands, as the phrase is; in other words, he had to relinquish his editorship, as a propitiation, to save the Journal. I shall not, however, in this place, speak further of this vitally important subject, but probably again refer to it.

Yet up to the very time of instituting my inquiry—and it is with humility I make the confession—blinded by prejudice and ignorance, like the rest of the profession in Hull and elsewhere, I deemed Homœopathy a vain and impossible thing; and even when I began to read, to investigate, and to put it to the proof, I had far more expectation of unmasking and exposing it as a fallacy,

* Sir John Forbes admitted and declared, that the science of medicine was now in such a state, with its number of clashing systems and modes of practice, that “it *must* soon mend or end.”

than I had of discovering in it that good by which the evils of the old practice of medicine might be obviated, and a more gentle, but far more efficient method of cure, be substituted.

As an additional motive for investigation, I felt that the time had arrived when something must be done, both by the individual and the collective efforts of the profession—the onward spread of Homœopathy must be stayed. Notwithstanding the oft-repeated declaration of my professional brethren to the contrary, it was too apparent that it was not “dying out,” but was steadily progressing, nay, rapidly extending itself;—not amongst the credulous and uneducated, but the enlightened and higher classes of society were daily becoming its firmest adherents and determined supporters. Nor was this onward progress restricted to any town or district; but throughout England, Ireland, and Scotland; and yet far more, throughout America, Germany, and France; and throughout all the States of Europe was it adopted and cherished.

I was convinced that this progress was not to be arrested by the raillery, abuse, and misrepresentation of the medical profession; amidst it all, Homœopathy had but the more and more increased,—*people would think for themselves*. I now felt assured that the only rational and effective, as well as manly and honourable way, of disabusing and disinfecting the public mind, was, to submit it to the touchstone of observation and experiment. I determined on its practical investigation.

Therefore, honestly divesting my mind, as far as I was able to do, of all feeling and prejudice against it, I first diligently searched and studied all the best works on the subject. I thus obtained a thorough insight into, and knowledge of the science;—of the peculiar mode of preparation and stated powers of its medicines—of their nature and properties,—and of their effects and application as remedies in disease: *points, be it observed, absolutely necessary to a fair and enlightened test and examination.* This being at length accomplished, I most stringently, zealously, and I may add, jealously, conducted my lengthened and practical inquiry.

My first discovery was my own ignorance as to what Homœopathy really was, and the equal ignorance of the rest of my professional brethren with whom I had conversed on the subject. It was, I confess, with a feeling of shame that I recalled to mind how we had misjudged and misrepresented Homœopathy. Strange, truly, that the Medical Profession should persist in denying, yea, in heaping obloquy and ridicule upon a science of which they know themselves—confess themselves—to be wholly or essentially ignorant! Nay, I have often heard the most witty, as well as the most serious and earnest declaimer, give a scornful negative reply to the inquiry if they had ever thoroughly studied and fairly tried it.

So wild and indefinite are the notions, not only of the public, but of medical men also, that it is thought that Homœopathy chiefly consists in giving

small, or infinitesimal doses of medicine! Now, *the magnitude of the dose has nothing whatever to do with the principle of this science.* The principle, the very essence of Homœopathy, lies in the law of *simile*; as usually expressed in the axiom, “*Similia similibus curanter*”—“like cures like.” Hahnemann himself at first tried the accustomed, or usual dose; but he was speedily compelled to reduce it; so powerful and harmful were medicines in their common doses, *when given on the Homœopathic principle.*

For my own part, I have not often found it necessary to use any form stronger than the globules;—and I have prescribed many thousands of times. But it is as consistent with the true principles of Homœopathy, to prescribe either strong tinctures or the crude drugs, as it is to give the most infinitesimal globule; I repeat, that it is the law of *simile—of like*—that alone guides the Homœopathist in his treatment of disease; the size, strength, or weakness of a dose is a mere contingency; he may give what doses he lists, but will soon find that medicines, *given on the Homœopathic principle*, must be administered, in nearly all cases, in very small doses, or the symptoms of the disease will be greatly aggravated.

For the sake of those who are anxious to know the principle of the Homœopathic cure, I will give its simple illustration. When a person, for example, is afflicted with sickness of the stomach, he will be relieved of it by very small doses of a medicine

which produces a similar kind of sickness in a healthy person when it is taken in large or over-doses ;—*like cures like*. As sickness of the stomach may arise from different causes, so is the Homœopathist provided with a variety of medicines, which produce sickness by different modes of action, and also cure it. Again, the tempting berries of belladonna, when taken in large or poisonous doses (as by children), produce redness of the skin, and also redness, soreness, and swelling of the throat ; hence, in very small doses, belladonna is one of our most certain remedies in scarlet fever, where there is redness of the skin, and, for the most part, soreness of the throat.

In proceeding to enumerate a few of those facts and circumstances which enforced the conviction on my own mind that Homœopathy was a great truth, I would observe, that no amount of mere reading or study of Homœopathic literature could have brought such conviction—real and indisputable—to my own mind. Had I stopped short here, though impressed with the sentiment that what I had read might be true, yet nothing but experimental testimony would have enable me, in my own heart, to realise that truth. I trust that this remark will not be lost upon those who think that they have done enough in having read a book or two on the subject, and finding nothing satisfactory in it. I unhappily committed this very error nearly ten years ago. At that time I read two or three books on the subject—certainly they were not the best ; but

the whole matter appeared too extraordinary to be real, and I cast it off as a delusion. How much do I regret that I did not then go heartily to work, and after fully qualifying myself, duly testing and proving it.*

In my practical inquiry into the powers of Homœopathic remedies, I resorted to every species of proof which I could devise, and of which the subject appeared capable. I have now treated—successfully treated—a vast variety and number of diseases, both acute and chronic, occurring in both sexes, and at all ages. In every more important and interesting case careful notes were kept; all the symptoms of the disease were primarily registered; and the effect of every medicine that was administered and every change of symptom noted.

I felt that the investigation in which I was now engaged was, perhaps, the most serious act of my life. Not only my reputation as a physician, my honour as a man, and the relief of the afflicted, but yet more, the interest of truth itself, was equally involved.

* I wish specially to notice and to recommend to all—the prejudiced and the unprejudiced—Dr. Sharp's Essays, now published in one volume. The calm, forcible, truthful, and philosophic spirit in which these Essays are written, deeply impressed my own mind, and determined me not to defer a practical investigation. Dr. Sharp is an old and much respected friend: and knowing so well the sterling probity and honesty of his character, his talent for observation and experiment, his knowledge of the exact sciences, and his clear judgment, I was enabled the more easily to divest my mind of that prejudice with which it was imbued. I honestly confess, however, that I had little expectation that Homœopathy would stand the searching trial to which I had determined to subject it; and I warned my friends who urged the investigation, that they might expect my exposure, rather than my confirmation of it.

To give a detail of all the cases so treated would be tedious, and indeed impossible, for they would fill a volume. I shall, therefore, at present content myself with simply citing a few examples of that testimony on which my convictions of the truth of Homœopathy are founded.

I witnessed, first, the painful and harassing symptoms of chronic diseases—both external and internal—progressively, steadily, and in some cases rapidly, cured by the administration of Homœopathic medicines, and that in not a few instances where the old plan of treatment by other practitioners had failed; and in two or three instances where I had myself been unsuccessful, by the old system, in giving relief.

On the other hand, I observed the distressing and alarming symptoms of acute inflammation of the most vital organs—as of the brain, the lungs, the windpipe (croup), and the bowels—arrested, overcome, and cured; and that in a manner so observable and so evident, even to the friends of the patient, that, on the repetition of each succeeding dose, a corresponding improvement was confidently looked for; while to my own observation, the effects and efficacy of the medicine were most clear and indisputable.

Yet how determinedly do practitioners of the old school repeat, that although patients treated Homœopathically may recover (of themselves) from chronic ailment, yet to trust to such treatment in inflammation of vital organs is nothing less than

the abandonment of the hapless patient. Happy abandonment! yea, and fortunate escape from the lancet and leeches, from blisters and cupping glasses, and from all those other appliances which, by *destroying vital energy, paralyse restorative power!*

Indeed, I here wish, in the most emphatic manner, to notice, that it is especially in acute inflammation of the vital organs of the body (as of the brain, the lungs, the stomach and bowels, &c.) that the curative action of Homœopathic remedies is so decided and so rapid. How unfortunate, then, is it, that the professional opponents of Homœopathy should, in their total ignorance of the science, have stumbled upon that very point for their misrepresentation and attack which is notoriously the strongest and most invulnerable! *It is these very cases, before all others, that the Homœopathic physician would select to prove to the inquirer, or to the unbeliever, the truly extraordinary power and efficacy of this system of treatment.* To this subject I shall again have occasion to refer.

I shall now describe, a little more definitely, the way in which I investigated and tested the powers of Homœopathic medicines. I first gave an unmedicated powder (simply sugar of milk), and of course without any result. I then selected and administered the proper remedy; when amendment commenced, and a cure was effected. (I may here observe that all these experiments were not confined to a single case, but were repeated again and again.)

Varying the means of testimony, I then selected

some forms of disease, where the symptoms were well marked and persistent, and gave Homœopathic medicines, and noted their favourable effects. Then, unknown to the patient, I administered a precisely similar-looking powder, but one that was unmedicated; when the patients, or in cases of children, their parents, voluntarily observed, that “this last medicine had lost its effect, and done no good!” Medicated doses were again given, and again improvement began, and relief was expressed.

Again, I chose cases of internal disease (they were two of chronic inflammation of the lining of the bowels, and three of consumption), in which the symptoms were of a decided character, and where the old system of treatment had given but very partial and unsatisfactory relief. These were then treated on the new system—Homœopathically—and marked, unmistakeable improvement followed. On resorting again to the old approved method of treatment, the progress lingered and was stayed, but was again restored by returning to Homœopathic remedies.

Further, I wished to select some diseases where the changes effected in the condition of the diseased parts could be *seen* by myself, as well as felt by the patient. I chose, therefore, some of the worst cases of inflamed and ulcerated sore throat (which have been so prevalent of late in Hull and the neighbourhood). Some of these I treated first on the old and approved plan; and with the usual tedious progress; but, when I now substituted the

Homœopathic remedies, the rapid diminution of tumefaction and swelling, and the healing of ulceration, were most striking. Indeed, few things could impress a common beholder with more surprise, than the witnessing of the effects of Homœopathic remedies in the very worst cases of ulcerated throat and palate; and one or two I shall briefly notice, in exemplification.

As collateral testimony to such effect of Homœopathic remedies, I may first cite the case of a well-known and respected gentleman of Hull, who, though deeply prejudiced against Homœopathy (for many of his nearest acquaintances were medical men), was driven at last to try it. He was wholly relieved, in a day or two, of a chronic and harassing affection of the throat, after he had, for two or three years, suffered the best surgical advice and treatment, not only of Hull, but of London, without cure. He himself related to me, a few days ago, how, in but a few hours, he experienced great relief, and felt the curative effects of the “absurd bits of globules,” in which, at the time he took them, he had no confidence whatever. I need not add that this gentleman, having proved Homœopathy on himself, is now a firm supporter of it.

The first example of the remarkable efficacy of Homœopathic medicines, in “throat cases,” which I shall introduce, is that of a girl about twelve years of age, with pale puffy features, and all the symptoms of a debilitated and scrofulous constitution. The eyes were bloodshot, and the eyelids red and tender ;

the nose was very much swollen, and of a livid red colour; the left nostril nearly obstructed by incrustations, and a most offensive discharge proceeded from it. Both the tonsils (glands of the throat) were much enlarged, and studded with ulcerated points; the back part of the hard palate was similarly affected. Despairing of being cured, she had "given up doctoring" for many months. In rather less than one month the nose, palate, and throat were wholly cured; the chronic inflammation of both eyes disappeared at the same time. There now remains only a slight enlargement of the tonsils, but without any ulceration or any discomfort whatever. This was a case of *caries*, or ulceration of the bones of the nose, and had resisted all previous treatment.

I shall notice one other case, of a somewhat similar kind, as it was connected with your own Infirmary. Moreover, it not only shows the power of Homœopathic medicines, but is an apt illustration of their superiority over the old drugs,—of the new over the old system of treatment,—and that under the most adverse circumstances. It was a very distressing case of inflammation, with deep and foul ulceration of the tonsils, palate, and back part of the throat. The man had been under medical treatment for some months before his admission, under my own care, into the Infirmary. He was so worn down with disease and poverty, that pity for his condition, rather than hopes of affording relief, induced me to admit him. After remaining within the Infirmary

the allotted time of two months, he was discharged ; improved in bodily condition certainly, but with very partial amendment of the throat. And, as I could not hold out to the Weekly Board of Governors any hope that he could be cured (if cured at all) in a month or two more, his bed was appropriated to other urgent cases, and he was made an out-patient. On his calling at my house next day, to ask what he should do, and where get means of support, I determined, bad as he was, now to give him the chance of the Homœopathic treatment; and he went afterwards to a poor lodging. Though now debarred the comfort and the wholesome food of the Infirmary, yet, in the short space of but ten days, this poor fellow's throat, tonsils, palate, &c., were quite healed and cured, by taking Homœopathic remedies. This being one of my earliest cases of "bad throat," made a great impression on my mind at the time; but I have now, in my extended experience, found in very many instances, how astonishing, and for the most part how rapid, is the effect of the Homœopathic treatment in the worst cases of nose and throat diseases. These two cases are not only deeply interesting, as proving the efficacy of Homœopathy, but as showing its superiority over the old plan—curing where the old system had failed.

I will briefly give one or two more examples where, in other diseases, patients were cured by Homœopathic remedies when they had not been relieved by the old system; and I will select cases from the

Infirmary. A man had suffered from sciatica for above a year, and had undergone a great variety of treatment in that time. When he came into the Infirmary all the appliances of cure, as vapour baths, galvanism, &c., which your Institution affords, were used, in addition to appropriate medicines, but without avail, and he left the Infirmary. This man wrote to me a few weeks afterwards, that he was then at laborious work, having been cured in about three weeks by Homœopathy. Another man left the Infirmary unrelieved of a distressing pain of the head, after a paralytic stroke, which had quite incapacitated him for work for many months. He had a seton in the neck, leeches, and other means used; he then took Homœopathic medicines for two weeks and returned to work.

The next two cases possess a twofold interest, inasmuch as they were not only cured on the Homœopathic system, but cured *in* the Infirmary. As one of the men had been suffering for above four, and the other for nearly seven years, and as they had been under the care of several medical men, and had undergone a great amount of treatment, I determined, after a short trial of the old remedies, to treat them Homœopathically. Both were diseases of the urinary organs, and both were cured in three weeks. One of the men suffered much pain in the bladder, and passed a considerable quantity of blood in the urine; from medicines given on the Homœopathic principle, all his painful and other symptoms *daily and perceptibly lessened*; and in about a

month after his admission he left the Infirmary quite well, and commenced work once more. The other, a younger man, had suffered for seven years, and had undergone much severe treatment. After the removal of his other troublesome symptoms connected with the bladder, there still remained a severe pain on the left side of his body, and to remove which "the doctors had done everything" (I think a seton had also been set). By the administration of the Homœopathic remedy, which acted directly upon the part implicated, a small flattened stone became dislodged and was passed. This stone had evidently been for some years impacted in the ureter (the passage from the kidneys to the bladder). He left the Infirmary, quite cured, in three or four weeks.

The third case of cure, within the Infirmary, was especially interesting; first, the patient was cured of a troublesome and unsightly disease, which, said he, "had been a-coming on for above ten year." It was a pustular eruption (by *pustular* eruption, I may explain in plain language, a *pimpley eruption* containing *matter*), with scabs, not only on the body and limbs, but during the last two years it had also extended to the face. Secondly, because the approved medicines of the old system were tried by me for several weeks, in the Infirmary, without the least abatement of the symptoms. And thirdly, because when I at last prescribed the Homœopathic remedy, I at the same time stated that it ought to cure the disease, and that, doubtless, we should see the effects at once. I may add, lastly, that it was

interesting, because I recollect that the respected Chairman of the Infirmary Board (Mr. Gibson, of Prospect-street), was in the ward of the Hospital, and I had the pleasure of pointing out to him and explaining the cure, when I was giving directions to the House-Surgeon to report the patient as cured. Within four days of his taking the pathogenetic or Homœopathic remedy, viz., Tartrate of Antimony, the pustules and scabs began to disappear, and in some three weeks he was cured.*

Whilst I am engaged in writing these remarks, a case of acute inflammation of the windpipe (croup), occurring in a child sixteen months old, has come under my care, and, I might truly add, has just been rescued from close impending death, by Homœopathic remedies; the surgeon under whose care it was up to the time I saw it, replying to the mother's inquiry,—“that it might die any minute.” The child had been leeches, had taken antimonial wine, and undergone all the usual old and inefficient treatment for three days previously, without the slightest check or stay to the disease, so that I myself judged

* These three cases are chiefly interesting as showing what may be effected by some of the old medicines, of concentrated power, where given on the Homœopathic principle. The chief medicines used were spirit of turpentine, tinct. cantharides, nux vomica, and tartar emetic. The patient cured of the eruptive disease in so striking a manner, after other treatment in the Infirmary had wholly failed, took no other medicine but the tartar emetic, in doses of the 32nd (not the 16th) part of a grain. One of the other patients, after being really cured of his complaint by the medicine given homœopathically, remained a little longer in the Infirmary, and then had other remedies for some ailment of which he complained; for it must be borne in mind, that I had no Homœopathic store of medicines of which to avail myself, so that it was only a few diseases which I could treat at all.

that it could not survive the day without relief, so nearly had it been hurried to its end. The change by the administration of Homœopathic remedies was so extraordinary, and so unlooked for by the poor woman, its mother, that, in her gratitude and joy, she most thoughtlessly brought it to my house next morning. The day was very raw and cold, and, as I feared, a terrible aggravation of the symptoms was incurred, and the child's life was again placed in the utmost peril. The first remedies were again had recourse to,—a like subsidence of the symptoms was produced,—and in a few days the child was cured. Are we always to be told that it is “the imagination” (this child was but sixteen months old),—is it always “mere accident,”—or regulation of diet,—or are all Homœopathic physicians (and those who cure themselves and families in minor complaints) really what the old practitioners and medical journals say they are,—“dolts, impostors, and quacks”?—See *Lancet*.

Truly it is humiliating to witness physicians of the old school striving to explain away the palpable, the self-evident cures performed by the new system of medicine—Homœopathy! I can hardly imagine in what manner the following facts; as also the cases I have already cited, will be “got over.”

A young lady, a relative of my own, after her recovery from a severe cold, had still a troublesome cough for three weeks, which prevented her return to school. After resisting the usual remedies for this period, it was cured in three days by five doses

of the Homœopathic remedy. Her brother had a large and very painful swelling on the lower jaw, caused, it was supposed, by the hidden fang of an old tooth. By the application of leeches, twice repeated, together with poultices, liniment, and plasters, the pain, inflammation, and swelling were cured in six weeks. A fortnight afterwards, from exposure to cold, all the symptoms returned; and this time with such violence that he could not bear even a silk handkerchief to touch the inflamed and tumified jaw. I gave him three globules of the appropriate Homœopathic medicine, and in *half-an-hour* the tumour was wholly freed from pain; in three days more, by taking this medicine, even every trace of the hard and painful swelling was removed. Thus, on the first attack, he recovered in six weeks by the old plan; on the second, and yet more severe one, he was cured in four days by the Homœopathic treatment. The disease did not again return.

A boy, nine years of age, had had a severe cough and expectoration for two years. He had been under medical treatment, and had taken a table spoonful of cod liver oil three times a day all that time; for, having no appetite, it was almost his only means of support; and he was worn and emaciated. The oil was not discontinued, but in twenty days his cough and expectoration were wholly cured by Homœopathic remedies; his appetite returned, and he soon gained his strength and flesh. This was so unexpected by his mother (as well as by myself), that she took from his bed a poor crippled boy, of about

twelve years of age, and brought him to my house, saying, to my remonstrances on her bringing a child so crippled and apparently dying, that as I had “made a miracle” of the other boy, I perhaps could give relief to this. With one leg pined and shortened, the chest distorted, being also humped on the back, and with as severe palpitation of the heart as I have ever witnessed, I thought the child was really in a dying state. Its head was supported by the mother’s breast; while its prominent, staring eyes, purple lips and cheeks, and the throbbing in the arteries of the neck, showed the extent of the heart’s disturbance. I felt relieved when the child was taken safely home; and truly astonished when, in three weeks time, it came cheerfully, hopping with its crutch, into my room, to thank me “for mending” it. The admirable effects of the Homœopathic medicines on the heart’s action, &c. were evinced the first day of the boy’s taking them; and the progress of improvement was never interrupted.

It will be observed, that I have selected those cases (out of many others) for proving the efficacy of the Homœopathic system of medicine, which had not been found curable by the old method; thus demonstrating that the new system not only possesses a power, but a greater power, of curing disease. But this is by no means all: there are other circumstances of vital importance, such as the difference of the means employed, the condition in which the patient is left after treatment, &c.; and to which I shall soon, although but very briefly, allude.

I shall detail but one other case; and probably, from the lady's position in society, it may be known to some of you. It is that of a lady at present resident in the Garrison, on a visit to her son. This lady was at first attended for a few days by a surgeon of the town, when a physician was also "called in," who, after a brief attendance, told the patient's friends that there was no hope of recovery, and that she could not be expected to live, at furthest, above four or five days. The surgeon also expressed a similar opinion as to the utter hopelessness of the case.

My advice was then requested, and I saw the patient, together with the surgeon in attendance. I found her shrunk, worn, and debilitated, and supported in an arm-chair by the bed side, that being the easiest position for her. The small, rapid pulse, quick breathing, frequent cough, and profuse expectoration of purulent matter, in distinct pellets,—the greater portion at the bottom of the vessel, but some suspended midway, like round pieces of cotton wool soaked in pus (matter of wounds),—sufficiently showed, independent of the stethoscope, how severely the lungs were implicated in disease. I had, however, just had a case with like expectoration, which was cured by Homœopathic remedies in a few weeks; and although I could not give such medicines here, under present circumstances, yet the opinion I gave was, that notwithstanding the great danger, the patient might possibly get over it, and I counselled her to look hopefully forward. At

the end of ten days or so, I thought that we had gained some little ground; but the surgeon did not think so, and told the friends that there was no real change for the better, and no chance of recovery. From circumstances unnecessary to relate, I found one day, on my visit, that the surgeon had voluntarily left the patient entirely to my own care. Immediately, and for the first time, I proposed the Homœopathic treatment, with which I found the family quite unacquainted. It was acceded to readily; for the lady had for the last two days been suffering severe pain around both sides of the chest, at its lowest part, and for which a blister, and then turpentine in flannel, had been urgently proposed by the surgeon, but declined by the patient, as the former blister had failed to give relief, and she felt that she could not support its renewed application. This severe pain, of two days' continuance, was wholly relieved by the second dose of the Homœopathic remedy; and by the Homœopathic treatment, every trace of cough, of expectoration, and of all other symptoms, wholly disappeared in three weeks. The improvement commenced with the second dose of the medicine; and I pronounced the lady out of danger at the end of the first week. It is now just one month since I began the Homœopathic treatment; and for the last week of this time, no medicine whatever has been taken, for my patient is without complaint and daily regaining strength. I avail myself of my patient's kind permission thus pointedly to allude to her case; for, as

was feelingly observed, “she felt that Homœopathy was the blessing through which her life had been spared, and in simple gratitude was wishful to aid, in ever so slight a degree, in making that blessing known to others.”

Nor is it a rare thing to hear such expressions as this, respecting the Homœopathic treatment,—the language of the once sick room, the language of the heart,—grateful for the blessing of health restored by its means.

The foregoing is not a more remarkable instance of the immediate efficacy, in severe cases especially, of Homœopathic remedies, than one which occurred a few weeks ago in a neighbouring town. The family is from home, and I have not asked permission more especially to allude to it; but the recovery is well known to friends and relations in Hull. This lady also, like the patient last mentioned, had suffered from previous “lung affections.” She had, when I saw her in consultation with the enlightened surgeon in attendance, as well as with another professional gentleman, been suffering for three weeks from a severe and rare form of bronchitis (a plastic), together with daily bleeding from the lungs and incessant cough, which caused a sharp pain. Neither all the means used before I saw her, nor those which I prescribed at two subsequent visits, had any but the most temporary and partial effect on the severe symptoms. The patient was, without any doubt, nearly lost; I saw that she must sink, and that soon, and expressed those fears to friends in Hull. Being

again telegraphed for, I determined that she should have the Homœopathic remedy so clearly indicated in such a case. I took it with me,—not as the “odious globules,” but in mixture, with water and a little spirit. I explained to the surgeon its effects, and that although it was a drug used by Homœopathists, yet I had proved its efficacy in the doses contained in the bottle I produced. He agreed to give it in place of the mixture which our patient had been taking, and at his request the pills such as she had taken previously were continued; but so immediate was the effect and the change produced by two doses of my medicine, that the cough, bleeding, and pain left at once, and the lady slept soundly for six hours! She had not slept, on account of the incessant cough, pain, &c., for I know not how long before.

The anxious husband came to me in real alarm the next day, “on account of all the dangerous symptoms having gone at once!” I reassured him, however; but the following morning he repeated the anxious visit, asking “for some meaning of it all;” “for why had this cough, &c., gone in a few hours, when weeks were before spent in vain efforts?” “And my poor wife,” continued he, “has slept again for five hours at a stretch, and now calls out for food!” In four days more this gentleman had the gratification of supporting his beloved wife to the sofa in the adjoining drawing-room. To this day he does not know “what it was that did it,” for I had not, at that time, officially made known my

Homœopathic principles. I only replied to his amazed inquiry, that "he should know some day soon," and he will now read it in this letter. I am as certain as that I now write these words, that this lady's life was saved by a few doses of the Homœopathic remedy. It was continued three days; one day too long, as it had put a stop to the diseased action, and was beginning to produce its own medicinal effect. On being discontinued the patient was really without complaint.

But I shall forbear giving any further examples of cure. Decided and unquestionable as those now adduced must appear, yet they are not selected as being the most remarkable I have met with in the course of my practice, but I cite them to prove that Homœopathic remedies not only do possess the power of curing, but a power so great that they will effect cures where the old system fails to do so. For of this I am quite convinced, both from reflection, observation, and practical testimony,—and I say it in all sincerity and truthfulness—that many diseases are readily curable by Homœopathic medicines which will not yield to the old plan of medication. Time will enlighten the minds of all on this vital point; even the minds of medical men themselves. But time it may require; for the profession is at present so prejudiced, so tied and bound—yea, "so cabin'd, cribb'd, confin'd"—by the old doctrines of colleges and schools—doctrines which they have imbibed from their youth up—that even the powerful wand of truth itself, though armed with conviction at its

point, cannot as yet penetrate the dark armour of this prejudice and self-interest in which they have encased themselves. I add self-interest, for in our seats of medical learning poor human nature pleads hard, and hesitates to doff her official robes, and with the honours, to relinquish also the emoluments of office!

I say that I shall not bring forward other cases of cure, as it would be wholly superfluous to do so. My opportunities, at least, have been manifold, even from the increased number of the sick poor alone who have sought my advice since I gave them the benefit of the Homœopathic treatment. They have manifested the greatest anxiety for remedies which had restored to health so many of their own immediate neighbours and friends; and that in not a few instances where recovery had ceased to be hoped for. Let it not be supposed, however, that I wish to describe the practice of the Homœopathist as one uninterrupted course of success;—to do so would be idle, and trifling with truth. He, too, necessarily meets with obstacles which no medical art can surmount; but when overcome in the conflict, he has at least the satisfaction of feeling that he has done all that medical art could effect, and that he has not weakened or injured the powers of the constitution. The energetic practitioner of the old system—the man who fully acts up to its teachings—has no rightful claim to such a satisfaction as this. Thus, then, I conducted a lengthened, practical, and impartial inquiry into the Homœo-

pathic system of curing disease. I did so on the principles as laid down by Hahnemann, and by other high authorities; and discarded, as irrelevant to my purpose, the refinements and subtleties of theories, about which its opponents so love to dispute, leaving its practical proof and testimony uncared for.*

For me now to doubt the power and the efficacy of Homœopathic medicines, would be to doubt the evidence of my own senses, and the exercise of common understanding. I rest my conviction on the solid basis of experimental testimony—on proof. I do not come forth as a partisan, but simply speak that which I do know, and testify that which I have seen.

My testimony is, that Homœopathy is indeed a

* A different as well as additional proof that the infinitesimal doses do produce medicinal effects on the system, is clearly shown by the fact, that instances every now and then occur in the practice of the Homœopathic physician, where the peculiar and well-known symptoms or effects of the particular medicine given are observed, and are even complained of by the patient. Take, for example, the case of a lady, who had long suffered from painful symptoms of indigestion, for which she had had given to her, by her former medical attendant, strychnia. When she came under my own care recently, I prescribed nux vomica, in the dose of one millionth part of a grain (the third dilution) twice daily. After taking the third dose, she told me that she knew quite well what she was taking, viz., strychnia, for that she felt after every dose the peculiar feeling in the arms which she did when she took the medicine last year. (Strychnia, it is well known, is the active principle of nux vomica.) I could give several examples where the specific effects of other Homœopathic medicines have been indisputably evidenced, when taken in these infinitesimal doses,—certain testimony of their power or effect on the system. To deny that they can have any effect at all, is simply absurd. I find that some persons are highly susceptible to the most infinitesimal doses; while others are only affected by the lowest, that is, the strongest dilutions.

one grain
in 322 g

great fact—a mighty truth. Being so, it must, in a mere scientific point of view, be looked upon as the greatest discovery of the age, and important as it is great. As health is justly acknowledged to be the choicest blessing, in what glad and grateful language should not Homœopathy be spoken of! not only as in itself a positive good, but also as an escape from the old practice, which is environed with so much that is positive evil.

Such are the calm and fixed convictions which have been forced upon my own mind; yet this is the stone which the very builders and teachers in the profession would refuse—the pearl which they would cast away, “though it is richer than all their tribe.”

How strange, how anomalous, is the conduct of the profession! for if the virtues of but one new drug be set forth in a medical journal, forthwith the whole profession welcomes it with a trial, and adoption. But when the grand, the comprehensive, science of Homœopathy is, on the highest testimony, set before them,—replete with a cure not only for one but for all diseases,—they straightway cast it forth with mockery and abuse, without trial, and without investigation! Nay, just as astronomers of old refused even to look through the telescope which Galileo had invented, even so do professional men refuse to look into Homœopathy. How, said the sage astronomers of old, can Jupiter have four moons, when we ourselves see them not with our own eyes? and how can a tube of wood, with a bit

of glass stuck into each end of it, make the moons appear, even if they did exist? So say the old school of physicians. How can Homœopathy have power or efficacy when we do not see it by the light of our system? and if such efficacy did exist, how can these small doses make that efficacy appear?

But not only do medical men determine not to look through the telescope (Homœopathy), but they would break it to pieces, destroy it altogether, and cast it forth as a vain thing. If they would only first look into it in a manly and fair way, and thus prove to the world that no moons are visible—that there is no power in Homœopathic remedies—they would, at least, command respect; but they seek to destroy it by instilling therein the dry-rot of calumny. Nay, they not only refuse to test and prove its powers and efficacy, but they deal forth their severe condemnation on those who, in an enlightened spirit of inquiry, venture to do so, and who have the fearless honesty and candour to avow the truth as they have found and proved it. The veneration for the old system of medicine, evinced by physicians of the present day, seems to be as great as that of the disciple of Galen in the olden time, who declared that—“he would rather be in the wrong with Galen, than be in the right with any other physician”—so do medical men now seem determined rather to err with the old systems of medicine than to be in the right with the new one—Homœopathy.

It is with sorrow that I now feel called upon to

expose the conduct of some members of the profession. My object is only to advise the unsuspecting, and not to enkindle shame in the doers. It is this: a nervous person is told by a medical man that Homœopathic medicines are rank poisons, and destroy the constitution; but a person of an opposite disposition is assured that they are “all humbug.” He then brings forward the fact of some one having swallowed a handful without any ill effect, and declares this to be “proof positive” of the total want of power in Homœopathic medicines! As I know examples where some persons have been so practised upon, I make a special point of giving the simple, the most simple explanation.

It is this: Homœopathic medicines are definite in their action, and when taken, they affect only the *disturbed or deranged vital action* of certain parts implicated in disease; so that, when a person in health “swallows a handful,” he does not of course experience their effect, inasmuch as there is no *highly sensitive and diseased part* to act upon. Nay, further, on the very principle of Homœopathy—“*Similia similibus curantur*”—the aforesaid “handful” would not produce specific effect, even on a person suffering from disease, unless the medicine so taken were pathogenetic, or in other words, was the proper medicine for acting on that disease. When a declaimer wishes to produce a double effect, he tells how *several* different handfuls (we must charitably suppose that he means small tubefuls) were eaten by some one and no effect was seen. By

effect, he means of course the effects which he is wont to observe, viz.:—vomiting, purging, blistering, violent pain, fainting, &c. This, however, is but a more silly trick than the first; for Homœopathic medicines, if mixed and taken together, annul and counteract the specific effect of each other; and this even in cases where there is a disease to act upon. “Now see, how plain a tale has put you down.”

Here we see the excellence, the simplicity, and the safety of the Homœopathic treatment; and how favourably it is contrasted with the strong drugs, and the often yet stronger means employed by the old system of practice. Truly, well would it be for the public, if bleeding and blisters, emetics, purgatives, and mercury, &c., could also do no harm on their being used when they are not required!

That certain drugs do act specially on certain parts or organs of the body is acknowledged by all, whether of the new or of the old school of medicine. Thus Simon, not a Homœopathist, observes, “We know that medicines do choose their organs of manifestation with as decided, or almost as exclusive a preference, as governs the phenomena of inorganic chemical affinity;” and he shows that choice experimentally, by introducing certain medicines (“noxious agents,” he calls them) into the stream of the blood. Though all parts are thus exposed to them, “how differently,” observes he, “are they affected! Inject opium, and the brain suffers;—arsenic, and it is the stomach that becomes inflamed;—strychnia, and the

spinal marrow is acted upon;—cantharides (blistering fly), and the kidneys are irritated.”

I wish now to make a statement of the utmost importance,—so important that it should ensure the conversion to Homœopathy of no less a personage than one of Her Majesty’s court physicians, and certainly a most able and clever man, Sir John Forbes. In his latest work, published I think this year, he admits and honestly declares his evidence, that Homœopathists do indisputably cure their patients. But he affirms that it is by the effect on the imagination, and by the strict regulation of the diet, that all the good is done; and leaves us to infer that, if the diet and imagination were not really the only curative powers in Homœopathic practice, he should then think well of this new system, and as he repudiates “old physic,” as commonly practised, he would doubtless adopt Homœopathy.

I will now show that neither the diet nor the imagination could have any influence whatever in the cures I performed in the first 600 cases. I stated previously that I determined to test Homœopathy, though stringently and jealously, yet honestly and fairly; hence, in every instance, I gave the Homœopathic medicines myself, and either in the form of mixture or in powders,—sometimes in pills; but I never gave globules in the simple form of globules, nor did the patients know that they were treated Homœopathically. Besides, a great portion of my patients were very young children, and some even infants at the breast; so that imagination could not,

in such cases at least, be the curative agent; this would be doing Homœopathy too much honour, though certainly its cures are often marvellous enough.

As to diet, the subject was never referred to in my treatment; for, in the first place, my patients were chiefly the poor, too many of whom had no choice of viands, and it would often have been mere mockery to talk of their taking a little of this, and not a little of that. Further, it was the special object of my inquiry to discover if Homœopathic medicines—not if diet—had the curative efficacy claimed. In some cases of severe irritation of the lining of the bowels, and also in acute inflammation of the vital organs, I did, necessarily, give the usual and common directions as to the avoidance of wine, spirits, animal food, and heavy pastry, as every physician must do; but in these exceptional cases only was the diet alluded to at all. Sir John Forbes and the old school of physic will now see that these their objections are but like the fabric of a vision, baseless; and baseless also are all other objections which they must now conjure up and substitute; for I have shown to you that Homœopathy rests on the broad basis of truth,—not of the conjectural or imaginative truth of theories and probability, like the old system, but on truth as arrived at, seen, demonstrated by experimental observation, by proof, and by facts.

I will take this opportunity of stating that, in my own practice, I have never yet found it necessary to

give any stricter regulations as to diet than formerly ; and further, it is my conviction, founded on my own observations, that such is the power and efficacy of Homœopathic remedies that their action is not interfered with, as many Homœopathic practitioners—chiefly on theoretical grounds—have imagined ;—it is my opinion, I repeat, that Homœopathy requires no stricter regulations, as to diet and regimen, than does the old system or systems of medicine.

In concluding my own brief testimony to the truth of Homœopathy—testimony solely based on experience—I may observe that I have purposely adopted the briefest manner of stating the results of my investigation. Had it been meet to have entered into minute detail, not only in the few cases which I have mentioned, but also in the many hundreds that I have not particularized, the power and efficacy of Homœopathic remedies would, I am morally certain, have stamped conviction in the minds of all of you ; for, having no interest to subserve by incredulity or prejudice, I have the satisfaction of believing that, in the language of Herschel, “you would hold your former opinions and judgments without bigotry ; would retain but till you saw reason to question them, and would readily resign them when fairly proved to be untenable. He that refuses this,” adds Herschel, “is incapable of science.”

On one point I claim your entire reliance and confidence ; it is this, viz., that I have not, knowingly, advanced one single statement that is not in strict accordance with fact. This is a matter so

serious, that lightly or intentionally to mislead would be a crime against humanity itself; while, on the other hand, to withhold knowledge and testimony which may hasten that period when sickness and disease shall be administered to by the gentler, safer, and more potent hand of Homœopathy, would be scarcely less criminal.

I shall now proceed to lay before you the testimony of others, and the witness of statistics. I do so to give the more solidity to my own evidence, and doubly to assure your minds. I regret much that the limits of a Letter compel me, in this case also, to be brief as possible.

The evidence of individuals cited shall be that of the old school, and I first notice the admission of a confessed opponent—the author of the “Fallacies of Homœopathy”—(whose work my friend Dr. Sharp has shown to be one huge fallacy itself). This author could not deny the evidence of his own senses to the extraordinary power of the Homœopathic system in acute inflammation of vital organs. I myself stated, in a former part of this Letter, that it was in the most severe cases of inflammation that the efficacy of Homœopathic remedies was so undeniable and self-evident. So plain, indeed, that this boldest opponent confesses that it is indeed so; and he wisely adopts in his own practice the Homœopathic cure for inflammation of the lungs, and urgently recommends it to the rest of the old school, telling them, happy truth, that he has not used the lancet since! “*Ex uno, disce omnes*”—that is, from one sample judge the rest.

But I must bring you yet higher authority,—the evidence of that great surgeon and honourable man, Mr. Liston. Fortunately, he possessed a friend in a Homœopathic physician, Dr. Quin, of London, who induced him to try five or six remedies in inflammations, erysipelas, wounds, injuries, and other surgical cases. Though Mr. Liston was not a Homœopathist, he would doubtless soon have embraced this science to its fullest extent had his life been spared, for he tried it in severe and urgent cases, and necessarily, so far as he did try it, found it true. His experience was limited to the employment of those remedies which are required in inflammatory and surgical cases. In his Clinical Lecture to the students at the North London Hospital he candidly observes,—“I believe in the Homœopathic doctrines to a certain extent, but I cannot, as yet, *from inexperience on the subject*, go the lengths its advocates could wish.” (See *Lancet*, p. 106, April, 1836.)

Thus, with that liberality which always distinguishes a truly great mind, Mr. Liston hesitated not to make known publicly in lectures to the students, and otherwise, the extraordinary efficacy of the Homœopathic treatment in the diseases just enumerated. He only tried a few—I think six—medicines, and very properly confined his testimony to those which he had himself used; and with a candour that did him honour, confessed in a letter, now published, to his friend Dr. Quin, that had he known of these remedies before, he should have saved many patients much protracted suffering, and in some cases, he

thought, probably their lives ; concluding with the expression of his opinion—and with how much feeling we may well imagine—that the life of his own father would have been saved had these remedies been used instead of the lancet.

But I shall let this pass, and spare the feelings of others of the profession around, by not contrasting the conduct of this great surgeon with that which they are pursuing. Leaving the evidence of individuals (and those not Homœopathists) as to the efficacy of Homœopathic remedies, I hasten to bring forward public proof—the proof of statistics,—together with the testimony of a high medical official, and also one opposed to Homœopathy. Both of these testify to this efficacy, even in that most terrible disease which has ever afflicted man, I mean Asiatic Cholera. I cannot but regret that I am compelled at the same time to convict the very heads of the profession, in their blind prejudice against Homœopathy, of a conspiracy against truth, and against humanity itself.

I refer to the last visitation of cholera in London, when the Government, anxious for the future welfare of the community, determined to adopt the surest means of deciding what was really the most efficient treatment of this disease. Hence the establishment of a Medical Committee of the Board of Health, with the President of the Royal College of Physicians at its head ; and also the appointment of a most experienced Medical Inspector of the Cholera Hospitals. By means of printed forms, which were furnished to

each hospital, all the circumstances of each case, its nature and virulence, the treatment adopted, and the effects and results of such treatment, were daily registered, and all under the constant supervision of the official inspector. The accurate statistics thus obtained were, lastly, considered and digested by this Medical Board, and finally reported on to Government. I feel humbled in recording to you that this paid Board—these heads of the profession to whom Government had confided so important, so sacred a trust—deliberately, designedly suppressed the statistical report of the Homœopathic Cholera Hospital! This report testified that, by the Homœopathic treatment of Asiatic Cholera, above two-thirds were cured, while, according to the aggregate statistics of the other Cholera Hospitals, above two-thirds died. In what other language can I truly designate this conduct of the Medical Board but as a conspiracy against the truth and against humanity?

Truth, however, whether the truth of Homœopathy or of any other kind, although often attempted to be thrust deeply into the well, will eventually rise to the surface. Parliament demanded the whole truth; and then appeared to all the vast superiority of the Homœopathic over every other kind of treatment in Asiatic Cholera. This Medical Board found refuge for their conduct in the manifesto which I now quote:—"To publish," plead they, "the returns from Homœopathic practitioners would be to give an unjustifiable sanction to an empirical practice, alike opposed to the maintenance of truth and the progress of science."

Let me briefly examine this plea set up by the Board of Health, and justify my strong condemnation. I take their own words. Homœopathy is not “empirical;” it does not use secret remedies; and all the medicines are given upon certain fixed and established principles, viz., on the law of *simile*.

That the record of treatment furnished by the Homœopathic Cholera Hospital was not, in any sense, “opposed to the truth,” their own Medical Inspector, Dr. Macloughlin, testified. I quote his words:—“*All I saw,*” says he, “*were true cases of Asiatic Cholera, in the various stages of the disease; and I saw several cases that did well under the Homœopathic treatment, which, I have no hesitation in saying, would have sunk under any other!*”

What is meant by the third allegation, that Homœopathy is “opposed to the progress of science,” I confess that I know not. That it is founded on a true, simple, intelligible, and scientific basis—the law of *simile*—I do know. And how triumphantly is it contrasted, in this respect, with the old system of medicine, where each country, nay, where each college in the same country, has oftentimes its own particular system, such as Broussai’s, in France; Armstrong’s and Clutterbuck’s, in London; and Cullen’s, Brown’s, &c., &c., in Edinburgh; while now, each and all of these are exploded and modified into something else. In Homœopathy there is no division into sects; all its followers adopt the same principle of practice, founded on the same scientific basis,—“*Similia similibus curantur.*” We

may safely adopt that system as the best which cures the best; and if the Homœopathic is so immeasurably superior to the old system in Asiatic Cholera, a disease so rapid and so terrible in its progress (and this superiority has been proved in all other Hospitals as well as in London), we have evidence of efficacy and power which might well be expected to be also manifested in other diseases; and such truly is the case.

It is truly gratifying to my own mind to record any instance of candid and honourable conduct on the part of our opponents. Hence, I cannot forbear quoting the public testimony of that high-minded man, Dr. Macloughlin, the Government Inspector of Cholera Hospitals. He confesses that he is not a Homœopathist, "either by education, by practice, or by principle;" but yet he makes this remarkable statement, that, "were it the will of Providence to afflict me with Cholera, and to deprive me of the power of prescribing for myself, I would rather be in the hands of a Homœopathic than an Allopathic adviser."

Public statistics equally prove the superiority of the Homœopathic treatment in all other diseases, and furnish "testimony," says Dr. Cockburn, "which our opponents have in vain attempted to distort, twist, and explain; the facts remain unaltered and unalterable, and speak for themselves." As it is always best to take the testimony of an opponent, I quote from Dr. Sharp's essays the statistics of a few diseases carefully *collated* by him from Dr. Routh's "Fallacies of Homœopathy."

As these statistics, thus collated, were the Doctor's own, and made such an impression on his mind as to induce him, in some of the diseases, to use the means of cure in his own practice (as already noticed), and never to resort to the lancet since, we may safely assume their accuracy. The following are the severe diseases mentioned, with their treatment, and the comparative results of the two systems—the new and the old:—

HOMŒOPATHIC TREATMENT.		THE OLD SYSTEM.	
	Deaths per cent.		Deaths per cent.
Inflammation of the Lungs	5·7	24·
Do. of the Side (Pleuritis) 3·		13·
Do. of the Bowels	4·	13·
Dysentery	3·	22·
All Diseases	4·	10·5

I am sorry that I cannot, in the compass of a letter like this, present you with the various statistical tables, including all the chief diseases of the body, and which have been drawn up with the utmost precision, under the supervision of physicians both of the new and of the old school; in some cases, as in Russia and Bavaria, by command of Government. Without any exception, the results are very greatly in favour of the Homœopathic treatment.

I shall not, however, occupy more space in heaping proof upon proof, being satisfied that what I have now adduced must be quite sufficient to convince every candid mind. The examples of cure which have occurred in my own practice were selected from the number of those which had not been found curable on the old system of medicine. This selec-

tion was made with the two-fold purpose of proving that diseases are not only readily cured by Homœopathic medicines, but cured where the old plan of treatment has been found inefficient.

I find that I have not cited any cases of cure of severe disorders of the stomach and bowels, as indigestion, sickness, diarrhœa, &c. ; I must, therefore, in justice, simply remark that, in the severest forms of indigestion, with all its long train of troublesome symptoms, Homœopathic medicines possess an efficacy which is truly remarkable. Nor must I forget to record their power in diseases of the lungs, and in consumption itself. In the last three months I have had the deep gratification of perfectly restoring eight cases which had been declared to be hopeless and incurable consumption by their medical attendants, and four other "hopeless" cases of consumption are at this present time steadily progressing to recovery. One of these four cases is a dear and near relative of my own, who has been afflicted above two years, and exhibited the severest symptoms of the disease, as profuse spitting of blood, severe hectic fever, purulent expectoration, great emaciation, and the usual gastric symptoms. Medicine, except a palliative at bedtime, had been given up. Having proved the remarkable efficacy of Homœopathic remedies in several cases of consumption, I at once proceeded to the distant county of the lady's residence, and adopted the Homœopathic system. In the three weeks that have elapsed since my visit the most cheering and gratifying results have already occurred,

and hopeful anticipations are restored to her family. But, as before observed, I should fill a volume, were I to attempt to recount the evidences and proofs of the power of Homœopathic remedies, and must at once desist.

Those of you who have already experienced the benefit of the Homœopathic treatment, or who have taken an interest in the subject, will lend willing credence to the truths which I have endeavoured to show and to substantiate; while those who have been halting between two opinions—between the old and the new, the worse and the better system—must, I feel assured, have had their minds awakened by the only testimony that can be of any value, namely, practical trial. *Homœopathy is a fact resting upon evidence, and not upon mere reasoning.* It is a strong fact—one which you cannot fail to appreciate—that *Homœopaths rest their whole on experimental testimony. They challenge thorough investigation and the test of proof;* but the profession only responds with cunning arguments or subtile reasoning, and will not look through the telescope.

Homœopathy has passed through the first stage of opposition from the profession, that of raillery and jest. It is now far advanced in the second stage, viz., that of abuse, and ere long it will enter the third or last stage, that of general adoption. It is sad to read the almost weekly torrent of abuse poured forth by some medical journals, which serves only to shew the extent of the alarm now pervading the ranks of the profession, that “their craft is in

danger." But vain is the attempt to thrust forth the new light of Homœopathy, and vain is the cry that "Diana is great."

It is a humiliating thought that the medical profession has ever treated its grandest discoveries in the same manner. But much as Homœopathists have had to endure, and are yet enduring, from the obloquy of their brethren, they have been persecuted less than either Hervey, the discoverer of the circulation of the blood, or Jenner, the discoverer of vaccination. These two physicians were called madmen; Homœopathists are only stigmatised as "fools and impostors, and the vilest of quacks." (See *Lancet*.) We are but vilified, thrust out of communion, and abused, for curing diseases; while Jenner was anathematised, and accused of blasphemy, for preventing or mitigating small-pox, "visited upon man by Heaven," as well as for "engrafting every kind of beastly disease, common to cattle, amongst human kind." Nay, more, King and Parliament were called upon from the chairs of professors to crush the evil doers; whilst in our day Parliament is petitioned to disseminate the blessing of Homœopathy amongst military hospitals at the seats of war, such petition, addressed to Lord Panmure, being signed by Bishops, Dukes, Lords, and other members of the aristocracy, to the number of about 700!

It would be instructive, and certainly amusing, had I space, to enumerate the "positive evidence" adduced by physicians of those days—men who

occupied the chief places—of newly-vaccinated children beginning to “cough like cows,”—of protuberances making their appearance on their foreheads “resembling the horns of an ox,”—of strange swellings breaking out in their faces, “so that the child’s mouth resembleth the muzzle of a cow,”—of “long hair beginning to grow on various unaccustomed parts of the body,”—nay, of long tumours, “like unto the rudiments of a cow’s tail,” springing up on the back! These, and many other “facts,” were gravely put forth by London physicians, “having testimony yet more and more” of such monstrous transformations and appendages! Whereas the only monstrous thing ascribed to Homœopathy is, that its medicines cure diseases which they ought not to have cured, and still worse, cure them, in not a few instances, where the old system of medicine had wholly failed to do so, and this despite all the hypothetical arguments of the old school of physic to prove that they have no power whatever.

The public, however, became at length convinced of the blessing of vaccination, as it is now fast becoming convinced of the equal blessing of Homœopathy; and then, why the profession, of course, became convinced also,—*they looked through the telescope!*

In closing these brief and imperfect remarks, I may observe, that I have withheld much that I wished to say; and had the present been the appropriate opportunity, I should have exposed the extraordinary misconception and misrepresentation

concerning Homœopathy so prevalent in this town and neighbourhood, as well as elsewhere. I have also refrained from commenting on the clashing systems, and equally varying treatment, adopted by professors of the old school of physic. But the time is certainly at hand when our youths shall no longer be taught that “bleeding is the right arm, and mercury the left arm,” in the treatment of any disease; but when the safe, the speedy, the truly effective, and the unrepugnant system of Homœopathy shall alone be tolerated.

So certain are Homœopathists that this time is approaching, that the projects to build Hospitals are by many discountenanced, inasmuch as the existing ones must, ere long, cease to be conducted as they are, and the Homœopathic treatment alone permitted in them. This point remains, of course, to be settled by the Governors of those Hospitals; and when we consider how rapid and general is the spread of Homœopathy, it would be idle to doubt that this consummation is far off; for it is not alone amongst the learned, the enlightened, the rich, and the great, that it has taken so deep and so wide-spread a root; but I now myself bear them record, that the poor cherish it and seek after it at least in an equal degree. Though I have always had the gratification of giving my advice to the sick poor, at my own house, yet that advice is now sought in a ten-fold greater degree since I have treated them on the Homœopathic system, so that I feel called upon, when at home,

to see them at night as well as in the morning; for I found that several had come even five or six times at the morning hours, unsuccessfully, to consult me; other professional engagements preventing me from devoting more than a certain time to seeing them. I feel, then, that I am not out of place in pressing upon you the facts just narrated, for I think that I have showed that it is the urgent desire of the sick poor to have bestowed upon them the blessing of Homœopathic treatment.

I wish to touch but gently, and with a sparing hand, on the evils which necessarily environ the old system of treating disease; and I would refrain from comment on the direct weakening and sapping of the vital energies of the body by the powerful though insidious operation of some drugs, such as calomel, and the immediate and more manifest effect of others, aided, as often happens, by the lancet, leeches, cupping, &c. They are accustomed to be looked upon as necessary means to the end, and both patient and practitioner are wont to view their inroads on the constitution as merely evidences of the violence and obstinacy of the disease! I pass even all this over to fix attention on a more dangerous, because a more unsuspected cause of ruined health,—I mean *the detention of drugs within the system*. We have some idea of the effects of the long continued use of bad water, especially if flowing through leaden pipes, or from a leaden cistern, of impure air, and such like, and avoid them when we can do so; how much more hurtful to the delicate

organisation of our bodies must be the obstructive and contaminating presence of drugs ! All medical men know and confess that the continued use of digitalis (fox glove) is to be guarded against, because, when it accumulates in the system, as it is termed, dangerous syncope or death is not the unfrequent consequence. But the evil effects of other drugs, not directly poisonous, and of a vegetable as well as of a mineral nature, such as aloes, colocynth, gamboge, &c., are seen when administered in costive habits for a lengthened or indefinite period ; the accumulation in the system being uncared for, and indeed unthought of. Even calomel, or blue pill, in children especially, is little stinted provided it does not “ touch the mouth ;” that is, produce salivation.

This is a vitally important subject,—one that demands the calm and serious reflection of all. There is no room to doubt but that the deposition and retention of drugs within the system is not an uncommon cause of disorders, from a simple feeling of derangement of health, to serious illness ; and what is worst of all, a hidden cause, and one unsuspected alike by the patient and the doctor. As this mischievous property of drugs has not, so far as I am aware, formed the subject of special medical inquiry, or at least of medical revelation, the evidence which I shall now adduce may impress some with surprise and others with the wish to disbelieve, but the facts are incontrovertible.

Dr. Macleod, of Benrhydding, after detailing some remarkable cases of shattered health from this very

cause, and the subsequent recovery of the patients after the perceptible extraction of mercury, aloes, colocynth, &c., from the body, thus writes,—“The cases described illustrate the fact that medicinal remedies taken for some time remain in greater or less quantity, and for various periods, in the system ; and that their presence either occasions diseased actions or prevents their removal when present.” He then adds,—“*The baneful effects of medicines, in this point of view, have not been sufficiently considered by the profession.*” After giving other examples where medicines had been tangibly extracted by the processes of the water cure, he thus continues :—“These second cases are important, as they indisputably prove that *vegetable* medicinal substances may be retained within the system, and while there produce, even long after the patient has ceased to take them, serious and baneful effects upon the functions and organs on which they specially act, and ultimately upon the whole organism itself.” “It is not,” continues he, “merely that these medicines so derange the tissues of the organs as to prevent them from acting in a healthy manner, after their use has been given up, but it is likewise, I believe, in consequence of the substances remaining in the organs that their functions are so modified.”

He then gives indisputable proof of the extraction of mercury (which had been taken some years before), as evinced by its producing, during its elimination, profuse salivation, the intense mercurial foetor of the breath, and the usual inflamed and

ulcerated state of the gums and mouth. Such drugs as aloes were extracted tangibly, and washed out of the compresses that had encircled the body; it also made the patient's room offensive with the distinct vapour of aloes!

Would that the medical profession would lay these things to heart, for they may rest assured that the public are now awake to the subject, and are doing so!

In what a different light does Homœopathy present itself to us! Here the small dose of the pathogenetic, specific, or appropriate remedy, is directed to act on the susceptible vitality or nervous power; or I may say the life of that part, and that part only, which is in a state of disorder or disease. By such specific influence the disordered action is overcome and corrected, the healthy functions of the part restored, and the body is placed in its wonted state of health. No contaminating drugs are left in the system, and no weakening or destroying of the powers of life has been incurred in the process of cure.

Such considerations lead me to allude to one other matter which greatly concerns the recipients of your benevolence, and should also interest yourselves as Governors of the Hull General Infirmary; and, indeed, the whole community; it is the comparatively quick restoration to health and strength when a patient is cured by the new system of medicine as compared with the old. When an individual has had the advantage of the Homœopathic treatment, so soon as the disease is overcome he feels himself well,

and shortly returns to his usual occupation. But when he gets through his complaint on the old system of medication, a long, long period of convalescence has, too often, to be endured; for the man has to make up for the blood of which he has, in all probability, been drained, or *previously sound parts* have to be restored to their former healthy condition, having been blistered or burnt, scoured and irritated, in order to shift or remove the disease from some distant part of the body which was *really* and only affected; or the natural functions of various parts are left in a state of irritation, or of disorder, from drug disease, &c., and thus the patient is long detained from returning to his labour, on which depends the support of himself and family; his bed and board must still be found him,—he must still be kept in the Medical Charity, and occupy room to the exclusion, it may be, of some other suffering applicant. Would that this were not so true a portraiture in hospital practice! It is, indeed, a matter of no unfrequent, nay often of almost necessary occurrence, under the old heroic system of medication; but it is one which would not happen in the Homœopathic treatment of disease. Let it not be inferred that in these remarks I am making special allusion to the Hull Infirmary; such is not the fact. Others, like myself, may escape the evils, or most of them, by laying aside the usual routine of practice; by not, in fact, doing that which the old system itself inculcates. I shall explain myself more fully shortly.

Happily for mankind, the old school of physic is

being inoculated with the new system of treating disease; and some of the Homœopathic remedies are (though without due acknowledgment) adopted by it. But whether, like Mr. Liston, practitioners of the old school will magnanimously proclaim the extraordinary efficacy of Homœopathic remedies, or they will go on to use them quietly, Homœopaths view with delight this homage to their system, and to truth. Nay, so great is the influence of Homœopathy, that the old-school practitioner now gives frequent pause even to his lancet, seeing with what facility acute inflammation is subdued by Homœopathic medicine alone. But yet more, it is a matter of congratulation to the community, and one that speaks trumpet-tongued to the profession, that in the chief medical society in Edinburgh the great question for deliberation this session is,—*whether blood-letting be really beneficial in inflammation of the lungs!* Had any practitioner of the old school but hinted such a thing a few years ago he would have been laughed at. The Homœopathist views these things as signs of the times, too significant to be misunderstood. It is *not* strange that all this should have been foreseen just eighteen years ago, by an acute author, opposed to Homœopathy. Dr. Millingen, Surgeon to the Forces, and Physician to the Hanwell Lunatic Asylum, in his “Curiosities of Medical Experience,” says,—“The Homœopathic system is destined to operate a gradual but material revolution in the *practice* of medicine.” And he yet more forcibly states that,—“He can

prove, by the evidence of facts, supported by practical reasoning, that the art of healing is more indebted to the Homœopathic doctrines than to any system that has hitherto been delivered in our schools!" This is candidly acknowledged by one while writing against the *doctrines* of Hahnemann! The few Homœopathic remedies which Mr. Liston tried—the extraordinary efficacy of which he proclaimed to his class—and acknowledged also in a letter, now published, to Dr. Quin, will soon prove the little leaven that leavens the whole lump. Others will take a few more of the remedies, bit by bit, until the whole Homœopathic system be adopted.

I beg, however, not to be understood as condemning, *in toto*, the old system of medicine,—this would be an injustice. On the contrary, there are a few, and but a few—men of experience, of calm thought and solid judgment—under whose guidance the old system of medicine becomes efficient in the cure of disease. It will ever be found that such men select drugs whose medicinal effects are of certain or well-ascertained powers; there is a definite simplicity in their prescriptions,—a self-evident purpose,—and above all, they avoid that almost universal evil of jumbling up divers drugs into the same mixture.* It is these who are always the most successful in their treatment of disease; yet it rarely happens that they are the most looked up to by their profes-

* It is well known that a late physician of Hull was in the habit of prescribing from twelve to fifteen different medicines in one mixture; and of directing a pill, also formed of from five to eight drugs, to be taken with each dose of this mixture.

sional brethren, or most thought of by the public. There are, however, the more rational few who have been under their care, whose confidence and attachment are unbounded.

It is too often the bold, the energetic practitioner,—the man who assaults disease, as it were, by storm,—the man of many appliances and expedients,—he who bleeds or cups to-day, and blisters on the morrow,—the man of pills and mixtures,—that is looked up to by the admiring surgeons, and too oft, it may be, by the confiding sick, whose confidence he does indeed “mightily abuse.” Such a man often “takes the lead,” or is the “successful” man in his town,—as to the number of fees. But it is of him that Sir John Forbes, one of our present court physicians, writes, when he says,—“Nature often cures the disease in *spite* of the doctor.” Yet he turns this very conflict with Nature to account, and cunningly calls it a triumph over the *obstinacy* of the disease; and should the sick man recover, he is henceforth taught to consider his doctor invincible! Be the old system of medicine, however, ever so judiciously practised, it lacks, greatly lacks, the simplicity, the safety, the power, and the efficacy of the Homœopathic. Such, I repeat, is my firm, my honest conviction;—a conviction established on proof and practical testimony. As to the old system, I have myself endeavoured to practise it for twenty-seven years on the first model, and witnessed with regret the practice of some others on the second.

I was duly forewarned, that in proclaiming my

adoption of the Homœopathic system, I should be offered up a sacrifice to the offended old school; and the professional standing in that school which in the course of my long practice as a physician has been accorded to me, will be my first sacrifice. The first medical society in the kingdom, the British Medical and Surgical Association, which comprises among its members the foremost in the profession, did me the honour, about five years ago, to elect me their president; and at the expiration of my year of office, constituted me perpetual vice-president. This Association will now, to my regret, require of me the sacrifice of resignation, or I must suffer expulsion. Strange, passing strange, that just five years ago, when the Association held its annual meeting at Brighton, I opened the proceedings as its president; there were also present at that annual meeting, the president of the Royal College of Physicians and the president of the Royal College of Surgeons, when, after deliberation and discussion, Homœopathy and Homœopathic physicians were alike denounced!

As to your own Medical Charity, the Hull General Infirmary, the office which I hold as Senior Physician, I do not, at present, intend to resign: and I withdrew the resignation (in case of noncompliance with my request for Homœopathic medicines) which I had placed in the hands of the Chairman of the Infirmary Weekly Board, Mr. Gibson. I bowed to the Board's refusal, and here the matter ended. I withdrew my resignation at the sugges-

tion of friends, who considered that, such is now the progressive, the rapid spread of Homœopathy, that, ere long, a great majority of the Governors would wish for it, or request its being adopted in the Infirmary;—when I, as one physician at least, should be at my post, anxious and ready to carry out their desire. This, with some other reasons of less moment, such as the expressed intention of a few of the profession to have me “turned out”—a thing which few Englishmen like,—induced me to brave all the insinuations and attacks, on the score of “my consistency,” nay, even of the “sincerity” of my convictions, which might, and which indeed have, with so much illiberality been cast upon me. How true it is that good may, under certain circumstances, come out of evil! For, as truth and integrity of character are, by all but the most abandoned, above all things most valued and most watchfully guarded, so must my sincerity—my belief in the truth, in the value and efficacy of Homœopathy, have been deep-rooted indeed, to have enabled me to brave and to bear, even the likelihood of a whisper, against such principles; much more to endure the almost certainty with which I too truly foretold they would both be assailed. I need scarcely add, how gratefully I seize upon this opportunity of placing the truth, in simplest garb, before you; and of telling to yourselves my reasons for at present remaining at my post. I shall make use of such medicines as I find in the Infirmary; make, of course, the best and most efficient use of them.

Such, then, are the reasons for my leaving the unsatisfactory and uncertain paths of the old school of physic; and such the kind of evidence that has *compelled* me to see and acknowledge the truth and inestimable value of the new, the more satisfactory, and more certain system of Homœopathy. And yet, truly, some find it no light matter to pay sacrifice to truth; and how oft does every paltry passion in our nature take alarm at being offered up to her. Pride—professional pride—refuses to bend her head to the confession, that she has for a life-long while,—with all her assumption of superior knowledge,—been really the dupe of school and college-taught systems.—Self-interest takes the alarm, and clings to her present securities of professional profit.—Fear puts her trembling fingers to her lips, and shrinks from encountering the jeer and the scorn of those who cannot or dare not think for themselves, and would affright others from doing so.—Prejudice, with darkened brow, frowns on the light of truth, and will not come to the light.—While falsehood says “’tis a lie, and all its followers are impostors.”

May not Dickens, in his present work, “Little Dorrit,” be considered as hitting off the old colleges of physic, in his celebrated “Circumlocution Office,” where the great object was to quench the progress of the age, and to show how *not* to do it? Do not the Mr. Tite Barnacles of the Circumlocution Office aptly represent the doctors and medical journals that look down in amazed contempt on any poor “Clennam” like myself, who makes inquiry into

the truth of a thing, and “wants to know”?—“I say,—look here—you must not say you want to know, you know,” says Mr. Tite Barnacle;—you must not “want to know” the truth of Homœopathy, say the doctors,—and if we still seek to know, straightway they cast us forth from amongst them as troublesome intruders.

But, assuredly, in the venerable colleges of physis Homœopathy is appearing, like the handwriting on the wall; while the terrible pen of Truth inscribes thereon—“Ichabod ! Ichabod !”

Thus, having counted the cost of daring to think for myself,—of daring to investigate practically the Homœopathic doctrines,—doctrines which so deeply affect the medical profession,—I honestly and fearlessly avow my convictions of their truth and inestimable value; and this I do after much diligent and careful inquiry,—after having subjected them to every mode of proof that my mind suggested; and of which they were capable. Although by no means ambitious of becoming a martyr, I am yet prepared, for truth’s sake, to pay the penalty,—be that penalty the loss of friends or the loss of profit, with both of which I have been threatened. One loss at least I shall not suffer,—the loss of that self-respect which upholds every right-doer. Come what may, there will remain the consciousness of integrity.

I am, My Lords, Ladies, and Gentlemen,

Your very obedient Servant,

FEWSTER ROBERT HORNER, M.D.

Since the above was written, a general meeting of the Governors of the Hull General Infirmary has been convened. As my last request for two separate wards, Homœopathic medicines, and a dispenser, was addressed to the Governors, as also my resignation if the request was not complied with, (and not to the Weekly Board,) they only had the power and right of reply. As it appeared that a majority of the Governors present were not prepared to make the arrangement asked for, I tendered my resignation; for I found that so reckless a spirit of opposition had been stirred up by my colleagues, that I should have been thwarted and opposed at every turn,—this spirit being even infused into the house-surgeon, dispenser, nurses, &c. Under such lamentable circumstances, it was evident that no good could be done, even by the limited practice of Homœopathy which I at first contemplated.

I thought it well, therefore, for the sake of the pecuniary interest of the Infirmary, to resign my office; for I knew, that if my request had been refused by a vote of the meeting, a large portion of the subscribers would have at once withdrawn their subscriptions. I regret the sacrifice,—not on my own account, but on that of Homœopathy and of truth.

F. R. HORNER.

HULL, *6th July*, 1857.

A BRIEF EXPOSURE

OF DR. KING'S PAMPHLET; INCLUDING ALSO THE ANONYMOUS ONE.

“You have bid me to a dish—the which, if I do not carve most curiously, say my knife is naught.”—SHAKSPEARE.

I FEEL called upon very briefly to notice two pamphlets which have just been published to controvert my own. This duty is a most painful one, as it compels me to expose to the public the spirit of rancour and alarm with which the medical profession of Hull is now possessed; and yet more sad, to convict some of its members of untruthfulness itself. My pamphlet, say they, “*must be put down.*” Need I repeat to them that this can never be done by mere abuse and *concerted denial of truth*? The public will be satisfied with nothing less than practical testimony,—with facts and with proof; nay, I know that some of the medical men of the town have been assured by their patients that, unless the statements and investigations contained in my pamphlet can be disproved by them, and *by a mode of practical inquiry as satisfactory and conclusive as my own*, the evidence of the truth of Homœopathy which I have adduced cannot be resisted, and will certainly be acted upon by the public. This is the view which every sensible man takes of the question. How lamentable, then, is the position in which the medical profession of Hull have placed themselves; substituting but personal abuse for investigation—concerted denial of facts for experiment! Why, why, I repeat, do they not rather attempt “to put down the pamphlet” *by an honest, enlightened, and practical investigation of Homœopathy itself*? Let them first duly qualify themselves for the task, and then adopt the method pointed out by myself, or discover a more stringent and satisfactory one. I invite, nay challenge them to this only test on which the public will or can place any reliance. But, alas! “like

the deaf adder that stoppeth her ears," they choose rather to deny the truth than to investigate it; nay, they turn aside when it is offered to be placed before their eyes!

It will not soon be forgotten by the people of Hull, that I not only made such offer, but urgently requested to be allowed to prove the superior efficacy of the Homœopathic treatment in the Hull Infirmary; when the medical officers, so far from seizing upon so direct an opportunity of witnessing against the "humbug," the "quackery," and the "worthlessness" of Homœopathy, and of exposing it to the world, shrunk from this fair and open test of its merits, and drew up their celebrated protest against my being allowed so to practise and prove it, and clamoured for my dismissal. This fact speaks trumpet-tongued! Thus, they shut their eyes in fear and prejudice, and cry,—“Behold, there is no light!”

The first pamphlet, written by a surgeon of the town, Dr. King, has already, both privately and on a more public occasion, been denounced by his medical brethren “as worse than nothing,”—“a mere pretence for getting himself talked of;” and, as his well-known itching for popularity—his arts for “bringing his name before the public” were then so smartly rebuked, it would be ungentle in me, after such condemnation, to say more of this author and his object in writing. His misstatements I must visit with the penalty of exposure; but his long tirade of personal abuse, of which three-fourths of his pamphlet consists, with the crafty attempt, by stringing portions of unconnected sentences together, to make it appear that I have said that which I have not, I can pardon, and “let pass by me as the idle wind which I respect not.”

The other pamphlet—an anonymous, and I regret to say an untruthful and even libellous production—I should not have noticed at all had it not borne unmistakeable evidence of having been trumped up by a confederacy of individuals;—the names of Sir H. Cooper, Dr. Sandwith, of Beverley, and a Mr. Cage appear as contributors. The initials of its putative author have been set forth; he is already known at Derby and elsewhere as the refuted libeller of Homœopathy (see Dr. Pope’s pamphlet in answer to this person’s allegations). He is again unfortunate in having been led, so soon after his arrival here, into a disclosure of himself by the characteristic diction of the pamphlet to which he has attached his initials. But

I am glad to leave this distasteful, though necessary, account of the kind of opponents whom it is my unpleasant duty to refute; still more painful is it to expose to the public their denials of the truth and attempts to cast discredit on myself.

As Dr. King's charges against me are copied, though greatly enlarged upon, in the anonymous pamphlet, my exposure of the one will serve for the other. In the former I am abused, and in the latter charged with untruth, for stating that Mr. Liston tried and highly commended the Homœopathic treatment in his lectures and observations to students at the North London (University College) Hospital. They both felt the importance, yea, the necessity, of "putting down the pamphlet" on so vital a matter as this; for if it went forth to the public that "the first surgeon of his age," as Dr. King so justly describes Mr. Liston, had proved and borne testimony to the extraordinary effects of the Homœopathic treatment, it would at once be an annihilating blow to ignorant and prejudiced attacks.

What a testimony to the truth and value of the new system of medicine, if such a man as Liston vouched for its efficacy! Liston,—who was not only acknowledged by all to be the greatest surgeon of his time, but equally known as the most upright, honest, and independent of men! Hence, they denied my statements; and, as usual with them, bolstered up their denial with what they call evidence!—that is, *the mere assertions of other medical men, as interested and as anxious as themselves "to put down the pamphlet" and Homœopathy.* Such is the only kind of "evidence" they cite, or can get together at all, throughout their denunciations.

But the public themselves shall judge how unscrupulous are the men with whom it is my misfortune now to have to do. I proceed to quote, at some length, Mr. Liston's own words, from one of his lectures delivered to the students at the North-London Hospital; and I make the extract, not from an interested source, but from the *Lancet* itself,—notorious for its abuse of Homœopathy. These observations of Mr. Liston are to be found in the numbers for February and April, 1836, and also in later numbers of that journal.

Having alluded to several cases of cure by the Homœopathic medicine, in one of which he tells us, that after its administration, in "twenty-four hours the disease had quite disappeared;" and that

in another, the patient "was cured in two or three days, although in her previous attacks she was seldom under a fortnight;"—he gives to the students the result of his experience and reflections in these words:—"Of course we cannot pretend to say positively in what way this effect is produced, *but it seems almost to act like magic*; however, so long as we benefit our patients by the treatment we pursue, *we have no right to condemn the principle upon which this treatment is recommended and pursued*. You know that this remedy (belladonna) is recommended by the Homœopathists in this affection, because it produces upon the skin a fiery eruption or efflorescence, accompanied by inflammatory fever;—'*Similia similibus curantur*,' say they. They give, in cases where a good night's rest is required, those substances which generally in healthy subjects produce great restlessness, instead of exhibiting, as others do, those medicines termed sedatives. It is like driving out one devil by sending in another."

"*I believe in the Homœopathic doctrines* to a certain extent; but I cannot as yet, from inexperience on the subject, go the length its advocates would wish in as far as regards the very minute doses of some of their medicines. The medicines in the above cases were certainly given in much smaller doses than have ever hitherto been prescribed.

"*The beneficial effects, as you witnessed, are unquestionable*. I have, however, seen similar good effects of the belladonna, prepared according to the Homœopathic Pharmacopœia, in a case of very severe Erysipelas of the head and face, under the care of my friend Dr. Quin. The inflammatory symptoms and local signs disappeared with very great rapidity. Without adopting the theory of this medical sect, *you ought not to reject its doctrines without due examination and enquiry*."—See *Lancet*, April 16th, 1836.

In the February number of the *Lancet*, Mr. Liston speaks of cures of Erysipelas, by belladonna, "*the most satisfactory and successful he had ever seen*;" telling the students that "*it was given on the Homœopathic principle*." And in another of the *Lancet's* reports of the North London Hospital, we read the gratifying and important fact—"Aconite has superseded bleeding in many cases at this hospital."—p. 807, Feb. 13th, 1836.

That Mr. Liston's reliance on the great efficacy of these Homœopathic medicines which he had tested was confirmed, he gives us proof in the second edition of his work, "The Elements of Surgery." For example, at page 61, he again testifies to the "great advantage and often the most extraordinary effect upon the disease," from the Homœopathic remedy, belladonna, in doses of *the sixteenth part of a grain*. In the same paragraph, he previously bears witness to the virtues of another of our remedies, Aconite;—"its exhibition," says he, "in this and other inflammatory affections, is often followed by great abatement of vascular excitement, *so that the necessity for abstraction of blood is done away with!*"

I could adduce the letter of Dr. Quin, a Homœopathic physician, and one of the most esteemed friends of Mr. Liston, in which he informs me, that but a few days before this great surgeon's sudden death, he spoke of placing himself under his care, "if he did not soon begin to improve more rapidly."

After such testimony as the above,—Mr. Liston's own,—what will my readers say to the "evidence" got up by my opponents,—"conclusive—unimpeachable—irresistible," as it is called! I beg to quote a single example of this style of evidence, and as I have termed it, "concerted denial of facts;"—its bare audacity is painful and humiliating to contemplate. After expressing his "amazement" that I could say that Mr. Liston ever testified to the efficacy of the Homœopathic treatment, a Mr. Cage, the "evidence," thus proceeds:—"I say, emphatically, that Dr. Horner's assertion is *simply untrue*; and I challenge him to show that Mr. Liston ever prescribed a Homœopathic dose of *any remedy* in University College Hospital." I have accepted the challenge,—Mr. Liston himself is my witness, my readers the jury!

My thanks are due to my opponents for giving me this further opportunity of proving, by Mr. Liston's own published works, lectures, &c., what was the estimate formed of the Homœopathic treatment of disease by the greatest surgeon of the age.

As it will be satisfactory to my readers to know how it happened that Mr. Liston adopted the Homœopathic treatment in the various surgical diseases that daily came under his care, I will quote from the obituary notice of this great surgeon, published by his friend Dr. Quin. He says,—“In the course of our frequent consultations and

conversations, we generally communicated to one another any interesting facts or cases occurring in our respective practice; and one day, in the beginning of January, 1836, he was lamenting over the fatality that attended his treatment of the great majority of cases admitted into his hospital, with erysipelas of the head, and stated that in the physicians' wards the results were much the same as in the surgical wards. I mentioned that I also had had several very severe cases, but that they had every one recovered under Homœopathic treatment." Dr. Quin then relates how he took Mr. Liston to witness the treatment of a very severe case of erysipelas of the head and face,—how Mr. Liston visited the patient with him twice a-day,—the great interest he manifested in the case,—and his astonishment at beholding the rapid curative effects of the aconite and belladonna—the Homœopathic remedies used. "Mr. Liston saw the medicines prepared by me, and administered some of them himself; he was so astonished and satisfied with the beneficial results of the treatment, that he resolved to try the aconite and belladonna. I suggested to him to prescribe one grain of the extract of aconite to be dissolved in several spoonfuls of water, and a spoonful given at intervals of several hours; and to dilute the same quantity of belladonna in a much larger quantity of water, and give a spoonful in the same manner. He immediately followed this suggestion, and the results are related in the following extracts from the reports of the North London Hospital contained in the *Lancet* of the 6th and 13th of February, and the 18th of April, 1836."

"Encouraged by the success which had attended his administration of aconite and belladonna in erysipelas, Mr. Liston requested me to give him a few notes of other diseases treated successfully by Homœopathy, with the names of the medicines usually prescribed by me for their cure. This I immediately complied with. He subsequently informed me that he had employed the following medicines with great success:—*Arnica montana*, internally and externally, in severe contusions, lacerations, and incised wounds; *rhus toxicodendron*, in sprains, luxations, and swollen and painful joints; *nux vomica*, in irritation of the bladder, obstinate constipation, and in some cases of partial paralysis; *bryonia alba*, in rheumatism, and in arthritic pains of the joints; *chamomilla*, in diarrhœa, and as a palliative in toothache; *pulsatilla*, in retarded and suppressed

discharges; *mercurius solubilis*, alternated with *belladonna*, in cynanche tonsillares (sore throat), and a variety of other medicines, the effects of which are familiar to every Homœopathic practitioner. Mr. Liston was particularly struck with the action of *aconite* in subduing inflammation and reducing vascular excitement, and he often expressed his regret to me that the power of *aconite* to abate vascular over-action and supersede the necessity for the abstraction of blood in many diseases, was not known to him earlier; because he was convinced that it would have prolonged the life of his father, whose death had been hastened, in his opinion, by ill-judged copious blood-letting.

“In numerous cases demanding surgical assistance to which I had called him in, in consultation, he invariably left the whole constitutional treatment to me; and frequently, after his professional services were no longer required, he continued his visits merely from the interest he took in watching the effects of the Homœopathic medicines prescribed by me.”

Dr. Quin concludes,—“I have no doubt that had Mr. Liston’s valuable life been spared, his enlightened example would have tended greatly to dispel the prejudices which prevent an impartial examination of the doctrines and practice of Homœopathy.”

After this deeply interesting and faithful testimony, which was published soon after Mr. Liston’s death,—after Mr. Liston’s own testimony, also published, even in the *Lancet* itself,—said I not truly, that it was painful and humiliating to contemplate that men are to be found who can dare to do that which the authors of these two pamphlets have done! The “emphatic” denial that Mr. Liston ever gave a dose of Homœopathic medicine at the North London Hospital, and the attempt to stigmatize myself with untruth for having stated that he had done so, merit a yet deeper censure and condemnation when the motive and object of such denial is considered. Precisely the same spirit of denial, the same object—whether single or concerted—I have tracked out and must bring to light in the “cases” which follow.

I next allude, and for obvious reasons as succinctly as possible, to the case of my patient at present on a visit to the Garrison. As I cannot submit to reciprocate contradiction, I obtained the courteous permission to invite Dr. King to call upon the family, who, for the sake of truth and simple justice to myself, have not only kindly

submitted, but are wishful to bear testimony to the real facts of the case. He will there learn from five *disinterested* witnesses how grievously he has been imposed upon by the physician to whom he alludes; and also, how much I have omitted that would have added to my own credit, but not to that of others. That physician is Sir H. Cooper, whose name, from motives of delicacy, I would not before mention; but he has himself, in a moment of ill-judged zeal, recently declared it in the anonymous pamphlet, and at the same time indulged in remarks disrespectful to myself; on a-piece, indeed, with the rest of that lamentable production. I must now tell Dr. King that, if he have any regard for his own character, for truth, or even but for simple justice to myself, he will accept the invitation so courteously granted to him. I need not, I trust, point out the course that he ought, on learning the truth, to adopt.

But why did not Dr. King and the author, or authors, of the anonymous pamphlet, cite also the evidence of Dr. Lunn, the surgeon in attendance?—(it would be a mere pretence of delicacy were I to hesitate to reveal his name *now*; besides, I must subpœna my witness.) He attended the case before, together with, and a fortnight after Sir H. Cooper; and if ever two medical men might be supposed to hold a like opinion, it is these two; they are professional counterparts and closely-knit friends, the one succeeded the other in the surgery of Mr. Lunn, sen., as partner to Mr. Lunn, and as surgeon to the Hull Infirmary; thus they have been professionally educated alike, and the one trod in the steps of the other. Dr. Lunn had but just communed with Sir H. Cooper when I was called in, and he at once, unhesitatingly, told me that there was no doubt but that the case was one of *vomicæ* (abscesses of the lungs); “that fresh ones were constantly breaking, so that the patient was in daily danger of being carried off;” and further, that there was no hope whatever of recovery; and this he oft repeated to the family. Is it for a moment to be supposed, that the surgeon held from the first and maintained an opinion so different to that which Sir H. Cooper, with whom he consulted, *now* professes! But Dr. King will learn for himself, by direct testimony, that Sir Henry declared that the patient could not recover.

In the case of the patient “in a neighbouring town,” it matters little what the surgeon in attendance may imagine *now*; his evidence,

like all the rest which my opponents have adduced, is but that of one wishful as themselves to disbelieve and to discredit Homœopathy. I repeat that the Homœopathic mixture was *substituted* for the one the patient had been taking; some pills *only*, such as she had taken some time before, were, as I have stated in my letter, continued at the surgeon's suggestion. I also distinctly affirm that, on being again called to visit the patient, I was informed by the surgeon that the aconite mixture had been continued (he did not then know my Homœopathic principles); but, observing the effects of the medicine on the patient, I at once requested that it should be left off. I will cite the surgeon himself as evidence of the medicine being given. I met him on a public occasion in Hull some weeks afterwards, when I replied to his observation of surprise at the lady's rapid recovery, that, "it was the aconite that did it;" when he rejoined—"Do you think so, *you know she took it but for a very short time?*"

The tincture of aconite should be taken but a very short time, as every Homœopathic practitioner well knows. Dr. King, who cites the surgeon's testimony, says nothing of the aconite *not* being taken; and even the anonymous writer admits, on the attendant surgeon's authority, that half a drop of the tincture was taken, and which is equal in strength to many globules. Now, it was when no more than two doses were given that, as I stated, the immediate and great relief from the pain, cough, and other symptoms was experienced, so that the patient slept soundly (for the first time) for six hours! No doubt such rapid and entire relief is very extraordinary in the eyes of practitioners of the old school, and it is really amusing to witness their incredulity and astonishment when they behold it. In the practice of the Homœopathist, however, such happy curative results, *especially in acute or inflammatory diseases*, are looked for as almost matters of course. Thus, Dr. Laurie, writing on bronchitis, says—"It rarely happens that aconite, when at all indicated, does not produce a favourable effect, *even after the first dose.*" This lady's case was bronchitis!—plastic bronchitis.

My opponents have, unwittingly, admitted too much! Were I content to take even their own small admission, the cure is substantiated; for, be it further remembered, that the patient was in a state to be readily acted upon by the aconite; she was sadly reduced when I saw her, and had been leeches four times, cupped twice, and also

blistered. But Mr. Liston himself has recorded cures, as I have shown, about equal to this in rapidity; and well might he state to the students at the Hospital that "they (aconite and belladonna) seem to act like magic." (See Mr. Liston's lecture, as quoted.)

But I am determined to pursue the statements attributed to the surgeon in attendance as they appear in the anonymous pamphlet. My Homœopathic tenets were *their* wholly unknown to him or to anyone; the tincture of aconite was not *ostensibly* given because it was a Homœopathic medicine. When I explained to him that I had proved it to be of great efficacy, and that it had of late been highly recommended in inflammations of the lungs by Dr. Routh, himself a writer against Homœopathy, he *willingly and at once* agreed to give it; neither the patient nor any of the family knew what the mixture was, or that it had any relation to Homœopathy. *The lady had been taking other mixtures in like doses for weeks before, and that without benefit*, therefore why, why should she be said to have refused this particular one, containing aconite, after one dose, "because she perceived no good effect from it"? And why should the anxious husband have come to me the two following days to inquire what it was that had caused so great, so sudden, and to him inexplicable a change? But I am willing to spare further reproof; and having shown, even on the admissions that have been made, the reality of the cure, I leave this tripartite evidence against Homœopathy to the reflections of the public.

The last charge against me is, that I took my case-books from the Infirmary to prevent the cures recorded in my pamphlet from being examined! What *can* my readers think of the opponents I have to deal with, when I tell them that I actually sent the old case-book to the Infirmary on its being asked for, *for the very purpose of the cases being scrutinised!* I say *old*, or filled-up, case-book, for the new one remained all the time at the Infirmary, and contained nearly all the cases of cure! The House-Surgeon informed me that he wanted the old book to take notes of some cases for the medical gentlemen, prior to the general meeting of Governors. But what will be the consternation of my readers, on learning that two cases, to which I never made the slightest allusion, *were substituted* for the true ones! For example, the case of a blind, or nearly blind, man, aged 44, was substituted for that of the boy, aged 19, whose case I so specially

alluded to, and pointed out to the Chairman of the Weekly Board *in the presence of the House-Surgeon himself! at the same time, I expressed my intention of publishing it!* I detected and pointed out this substitution to the House-Surgeon, in the notes he had taken for the medical men; yet the authors of the anonymous pamphlet even now bring it out against me,—charge it upon me as a falsely reported cure! My readers will judge how much I have to tolerate: the “rancour and alarm” of the medical profession of Hull must indeed be at a painful height, when it is driven to such means “to put down the pamphlet.”

But even this is not all. This House-Surgeon is induced to allege that he substituted his own treatment also for mine, in the man's case of bloody urine! Let me dissect this a little. Is it possible,—is it credible,—that he could dare, clandestinely, without any note of his having done so being made in my case-book, try his own treatment in so important a disease, and that for some weeks? Could he allow me to point out to a naval surgeon who had called upon him, this very case as treated by myself with small doses of the Homœopathic remedy? And further, could he listen to me, after the man had left the hospital, pointing out this as a Homœopathic cure;—could he, I say, do all this, and never hint a word of his own treatment to anyone, *till after the appearance of the pamphlet?* It is fortunate for the House-Surgeon that the Governors of the Infirmary will not think his statement credible; otherwise, such a setting at naught the medical officers whom they so carefully select, by his *secretly* practising on their patients, would certainly be visited with the severest mark of their displeasure. *I declare that this patient was cured, thoroughly and entirely, by the Homœopathic doses of spirit of turpentine, &c., which he took so long as any symptom of the disorder, bloody urine, was present. On each of my visits, I closely questioned the patient, and got from him an account of the effects of the medicine.* It is true, that when the man was cured he asked permission to remain in the Infirmary a week or two longer, “to see if his cure would stand;” and during that time, any “house physic,” or other common medicine, might have been given, *for the man was cured of the disease.* In the other case, I myself prescribed for the patient common remedies *after his cure*; not having, as explained in the pamphlet a case of Homœopathic remedies to resort to.

I here close my painful exposure of the most discreditable conduct that ever medical men, banded together, were guilty of. Not one word have they advanced against the science of Homœopathy,—it is only against myself; and they may rest assured, that not only the inhabitants of Hull and the neighbourhood, but every community of the kingdom amongst whom this pamphlet is circulated, will look upon their conduct with painful surprise and condemnation. I feel myself, as it were, dishonoured, in having to refute such calumnies as have been set forth, however complete the refutation be; and although to have let them pass might have given encouragement to a repetition of them in some other form, I deeply regret the necessity that has been put upon me to appear in controversy with opponents who have betrayed such mental characteristics.

It is a most significant fact, that neither of my opponents has ventured to dispute the extraordinary efficacy of the Homœopathic treatment in Asiatic Cholera! Surely if it be unquestioned that it is so preëminently powerful against the most deadly of all diseases, it is reasonable to conclude that it may be equally so against lesser ones. No doubt they found that Parliamentary or Government statistics could not be attacked by any “concerted denial.”

If my pamphlet had been duly read, these two authors would have spared themselves their outburst concerning Dr. Routh. I stated that the statistics were *drawn* from his book. In this edition I have substituted the word *collated*, as the more expressive. The statistics given are those which Dr. Sharp, with so much care and accuracy, collated from Dr. Routh’s book when he so exposed it in his well-known “Reply.” If they would read Dr. Sharp’s Essays, they would, in confusion, for the future be silent about Dr. Routh.

Their observations respecting the retention of drugs within the system, or rather their attempts to free the old school of medicine from this most serious evil, are simply puerile. They tell us, for example, that it is only when drugs are taken in large or poisonous doses at once that they contaminate the system; when every advanced student in medicine well knows that *it is the small and repeated dose of a drug*, calomel, for instance, that so certainly pervades the frame. They demand proof of the long retention of a drug within the system, affecting to overlook the unanswerable examples I have given: for instance, the cases of salivation, during the elimination

or extraction of mercury by the water cure, many years after it had been taken, and which for so long a period had made the poor sufferer a living barometer! Enough of all this.

I conclude these very brief remarks with a few short extracts from the works of some of the most eminent men of our profession,—*not Homœopathists*,—that it may be seen how the liberal and high-minded think and write of Homœopathy. Even Sir John Forbes observes—“Hahnemann (its great founder) was undoubtedly a man of genius and a scholar,—a man of indefatigable industry and undaunted energy. No careful observer of his actions, or candid reader of his writings, can hesitate for a moment to admit that he was a very extraordinary man. It is but an act of justice to admit that there exists no grounds for doubting that he was sincere in his belief of the truth of his doctrines; and that many, at least among his followers, have been and are sincere, honest, and learned men.”

Dr. Combe, the well-known writer on popular scientific subjects, thus writes,—“Let us scout quacks and pretenders as we may, Homœopathy presents too strong a case to warrant us to dismiss it with ridicule and contempt.” He concludes thus his enlightened reflections:—“If I were now in practice, I should hold myself bound without further delay to test its truth, by careful and extensive experiment.”

In France, the celebrated physician Broussais, thus writes of Homœopathy:—“Many distinguished persons are occupied with it. We cannot reject it without a hearing. We must investigate the truth it contains.” He died while he was engaged in his investigations.

In Italy, Professor Brera, the most celebrated among Italian physicians, says,—“Homœopathy is decried by some as useless, and by others as strange; and although it appears to the great majority as ridiculous and extraordinary, it can nevertheless not be denied that it has taken its stand in the scientific world. It has its books, its journals, its chairs, its hospitals, clinical lectures, professors, and most respectable communities to hear and to appreciate. Having attained this rank, it by no means deserves contempt; but, on the contrary, a cool and impartial investigation, like all other systems of modern date.” He then proceeds,—“Woe to the physician who believes that he cannot learn to-morrow what he does not know

to-day! Do we not hear daily complaints of the insufficiency of the healing art, and are not those physicians who honestly suspect the solidity of their knowledge the most learned, and in their practice the most successful? Let us always recollect, that the greatest discoveries have given origin to the most violent controversies. Witness the examples of Hervey, Jenner, Galileo, Newton, Descartes, &c."

America.—Valentine Mott, justly the pride of American surgery, says,—“Hahnemann is one of the most accomplished and scientific physicians of the age.” And Professor McNaughten, of the Western Medical College of the University of the State of New York, thus concludes his observations on Homœopathy:—“Whether Homœopathy be true or not, it is entitled to have its claims fairly investigated. The object of the profession is to ascertain the truth; and if it should turn out that in any disease the Homœopathic remedies are more efficacious than those known to the ordinary system, they ought unquestionably to be used. *It will not do for the members of the profession to wrap themselves in their dignity, and to call the new system absurd, without further inquiry. The history of the profession presents many lamentable instances of the obstinacy with which errors have been clung to, and improvements resisted.*” (See “Truths and their Reception,” by M. B. Sampson.)

Such, then, are the sentiments which the most enlightened and truly great men of the medical profession entertain towards Homœopathy, and those physicians and surgeons who conscientiously support and practice it. I could have given several pages of similar extracts from the lectures or writings of very many others, equally forcible as any of those I have quoted. Let me contrast with the foregoing impressive, liberal, and just remarks, the sentiments expressed towards Homœopathy and myself by the authors of the anonymous pamphlet:—“We are compelled to state that it is an absolute impossibility to bring our own mind to believe in the *sincerity* of a *medical Homœopath*.” Of myself they write in the last page,—“He has degraded himself to the position of the lowest advertising quack; and we say with these men therefore he must now take his stand, for such is his true position; he belongs not to the order of legitimate medicine, but to the ranks of charlatanry and quackery,” &c. &c.

Personalities, gross as they may be, I can well tolerate, and, I believe, forgive. But not one jot or tittle of the truths which I have advanced, will I allow to be impugned. Similar attacks shall meet with like rebuke and exposure, come they from an individual or from a confederacy of individuals. For the jeers, the scorn, and the illiberal remarks cast upon my convictions, and recent conversion to the Homœopathic treatment of disease, I find a fit answer in the last words of the late Professor Hugh Miller:—"I have yielded to evidences which I found it impossible to resist; and such in this instance has been my *inconsistency*,—an inconsistency of which the world has furnished many examples in all the sciences, and will, I trust, in its onward progress, continue to furnish many more."

F. R. HORNER, M.D.